

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

A	PPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
,	10/070,521	07/08/2002		Richard Spitz	10191/2251	7205
	26646	7590	04/10/2006		EXAMINER	
	KENYON	& KENY	ON LLP	JACKSON JR, JEROME		
	ONE BROA		0004		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	11211 1010	,			2815	
					DATE MAILED: 04/10/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)						
	10/070,521	SPITZ ET AL.						
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit						
	Jerome Jackson Jr.	2815						
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	-					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNI 136(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI te, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed  NTHS from the mailing date of this communic BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).						
Status								
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 /	March 2006.							
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ Thi	s action is non-final.							
	S) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.	). 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims								
4)⊠ Claim(s) 24 and 30-42 is/are pending in the a	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>24 and 30-42</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>24 and 30-42</u> is/are rejected.								
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.							
Application Papers								
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.							
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc	cepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	·	•	` '					
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-152	2.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119								
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreigr a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	n priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
1. Certified copies of the priority documen	ts have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority documen		·· —						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the price	<u>*</u>	received in this National Stage	)					
application from the International Burea	, , ,,							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	t of the certified copies not	received.						
•								
Attachment(s)								
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> </ol>		Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	) 5) D Notice of I	Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6)  Other:	·						

Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last

Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

The 35 USC 112 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph rejection is removed. As per applicant's arguments the addition of multiple embodiments or teachings into a single device is not seen to be new matter as applicant did not teach against using them together and to one of ordinary skill the embodiments would be cumulative and not exclusive of each other.

Nevertheless, Cline's teachings to one of ordinary skill make applicant's claims obvious structure and there are certain observations that the claims are vague and indefinite.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 24 and 30-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

There is no way to exactly determine the metes and bounds of claim 24 as the limitation "doped at different concentrations" is vague and indefinite. What are the different concentrations and how is one of ordinary skill to determine them? The specification teaches a 2X10E19 for the higher doped layer but there is neither a thickness nor a doping concentration stated for the other doped region. One of ordinary skill cannot determine the exact metes and bounds of the claim structure. Broadly one of ordinary skill would understand that the device needs to remain in the Zener regime of breakdown but applicant has not adequately stated or claimed what the structure and "concentration" of the "other" layer of the group is. The claims are collectively vague and

Art Unit: 2815

indefinite of exact structure as no claim states the exact structure to enable anyone to know the exact metes and bounds of the claims.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 24 and 30-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Cline '171, of record.

Initially, it is considered that one of ordinary skill is one who understands quantum physics and the process of Zener diode behavior, and particularly comprehends the scope of Cline's patent and obvious variations.

Cline comprehends, as applicant also has stated, that Zener diode behavior above about 5 volts results in avalanche breakdown and temperature variation problems. Thus Cline and applicant seek to limit the Zener diode operation of each junction to the "Zener" regime rather than the avalanche regime. To one of ordinary skill this obviously means that heavy doping is necessary for the p and n type regions of the Zener diode. Applicant states that 2X10E19 is the proper doping for the p+ or n+ region. Cline states that the breakdown voltage is dependent on doping (col. 5) and states (col. 6) that 5 Volt Zener diodes have approximately a zero temperature coefficient. Cline also states that such diodes need to be operated at a constant current or else have a temperature compensating diode integrated therein. Cline teaches a series of Zener diodes (figure 6) and because operation without compensating diodes is about 5 volts or

Art Unit: 2815

less one of ordinary skill would understand that doping about 2X10E19 would be considered an obvious design choice for both n and p type diode regions. Furthermore, because one of ordinary skill understands the theory behind Zener breakdown it would be considered obvious to adjust the dopings, number of series connected diode regions, etc. in Cline to practice Zener diodes of different breakdown voltage. The process of Cline results in nearly constant doping concentration of the regions, however, simple diffusion physics determines that there must be some difference in concentration between the center of the regions and the periphery at the junctions, and because applicant's claims and specification are not specific enough to determine what the "other" concentration is, the claims are not seen to structurally distinguish over Cline where the center area of a doped diode region is considered one constant doped region at least along the vertical direction and the peripheral area is considered another constant doped region along the vertical direction. Accordingly claim 24 is anticipated or at least obvious over the teachings and suggestions of Cline. Other claims are likewise considered obvious design choices, as stated above, to an engineer familiar with Zener diode operation and semiconductor device physics, and the teachings of Cline.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jerome Jackson Jr. whose telephone number is 571-272-1730. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ken Parker can be reached on 571-272-2298. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/070,521

Art Unit: 2815

Page 5

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jj

JEROME JACKSON PRIMARY EXAMINER